

CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
 SECURITY INFORMATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
 INFORMATION FROM
 FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS

REPORT

CD NO.

50X1-HUM

COUNTRY China
 SUBJECT Political; Sociological
 HOW PUBLISHED Semimonthly periodical
 WHERE PUBLISHED Peiping
 DATE PUBLISHED 15 Jun 1951
 LANGUAGE Chinese

DATE OF INFORMATION 1951

DATE DIST. 16 Nov 1951

NO. OF PAGES 7

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT NO.

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF ESPIONAGE ACT 50 U.S.C. 31 AND 32, ITS AMENDMENTS, ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE

En-yu (Gracious Friends), Vol III, No 6, Yenching University Publication, 1951.

CHINESE CHRISTIAN LEADER VOICES COMPLAINT AGAINST
 LEIGHTON STUART AND WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Chao Tzu-ch'en (趙紫宸)

The following address was delivered at the Conference for Handling Christian Groups Receiving US Aid, called by the Government Administration Council of the People's Republic of China. Chao Tzu-ch'en is well known in international Christian circles as Dr T. C. Chao, dean of the School of Religion of Yenching University. The announcement of his resignation as one of the presidents of the World Council of Churches was given wide publicity last summer.

Introduction

I wish today to complain against the sin of agents of US imperialism in utilizing the Christian Church for cultural aggression. This is a very serious matter. First I want to make myself clear on three points:

1. I am not seeking personal gain on the pretext of public good; nor am I taking advantage of this opportunity of complaint to give vent to my individual indignation.
2. I want to follow Jesus' instructions to tell the truth and certainly will not fabricate anything.
3. I sorely hate the crime of utilizing religion, for whoever sins in this way opposes the truth, harms society, and resists the Saviour Jesus Christ in whom I believe.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 1 -

CLASSIFICATION		CONFIDENTIAL	
STATE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NAVY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSRB	DISTRIBUTION
ARMY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AIR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FBI	

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

Stuart Despised Chinese

Some days ago at a meeting preparatory to this conference, when the matter of complaints was brought up, of my own accord, I said I wished to enter a vigorous complaint against Leighton Stuart. I have been acquainted with Leighton Stuart for more than 20 years. When I was teaching in the School of Religion of Yenching University he was, of course, my chief. On the surface he was an humble-minded, refined, princely gentleman, but in his inward soul he despised Chinese people.

His parents were missionaries in Hangchow and he was born there. He was well acquainted with the life of Chinese children in that city. He himself says that when his parents returned to the US on furlough, they would tell about mission work in China to arouse the interest of the church people so that they would give financial aid. When speaking, they would let their son Leighton dress in Chinese clothes and tell about the life of Chinese children. The small child Leighton was not pleased with such treatment; he was an American boy, and did not want to pose as a Chinese. In school, his school-mates would ridicule him as the son of a foreign missionary, causing him much grief. "America First" thus became an important element in his childhood consciousness.

Later, he became highly educated, and following his parents' wishes he came to China as a Christian missionary. Still later, he left his position as a theological seminary professor to become president of Yenching University. Outwardly, his administration was exceedingly enlightened. Humbly, he sought out talented persons, invited distinguished persons to become professors at Yenching, and sent outstanding youth to America for study. In the university he associated with several prominent Chinese professors in promoting complete equality between Chinese and Westerners; the professors lived in foreign-style houses and lived American-style lives. He did not ask American professors to live Chinese-style lives, but asked us Chinese professors to live American-style lives well above the ordinary level of Chinese living.

Outwardly, no one could see what his real attitude toward us Chinese people was, nor could anyone guess what his real motives were. How would one know that he despised the Chinese? He understood Chinese weaknesses well, especially those of the old-style intellectuals. I heard him say more than once that Chinese were like a pile of sand, unable to work together, unwilling to do so. All wanted to be leaders, but were unwilling to be led. He saw these weaknesses clearly, and practiced his method of "controlling Chinese by means of Chinese on those he gathered around him."

At the same time, his weaknesses were well known among the Chinese; he was an American, a product of the capitalist system, quite pleased with flattery, and in the end unable to understand the character and attitudes of the old-style Chinese scholars. He could not understand why men would not play the sycophant, why they would not continually say, "Thank you! Thank you!" Still less did he realize the stalwart independence of the old-style nobility. So some clever Chinese turned his teachings to influence his conduct; they showed him respect, flattered him, tried to please him, to take some advantage of him.

If he did not despise the Chinese, why was he at loggerheads with Wu Lei-ch'uan, the acting president, and why did he oust him? Chou I-ch'un became acting president, was at odds with him, and was dismissed. Lu Chih-wei (C. W. Luh) became acting president and was about to be fired, when luckily the Japanese came along and gave old Stuart a chance to restore his position as president. Why all this? If he did not despise the Chinese people why was an upright Christian young man treated by him as a beggar?

- 2 -

CONFIDENTIAL **CONFIDENTIAL**

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

This young man mistakenly accepted 800 dollars from him and then finding out Stuart's attitude, out of poverty collected 800 dollars and sent them back to him. I say that when Leighton Stuart wanted to use a Chinese, he had a technique for caging him; and when he wanted to get rid of a person he would turn his face aside and not look at him. I think that despising Chinese became in his life the starting point for his use of the Christian Church for cultural aggression on China.

Stuart Used Religion for Cultural Aggression

Secondly, I want to present the facts about Leighton Stuart's use of religion for cultural aggression. I do not deny that he grew up in a home of relatively deep religious faith, but the age in which he lived and the education he received caused his religion to be diluted and distorted. His young manhood coincided with the time when liberal and humanistic theology were most in vogue in the US, and when American capitalism was rapidly developing into the stage of imperialism. He experienced the influence of such thinking and social change, just as many other theologians in his country did. When he spoke of religion, it was like a shower of flowers from the sky, but in his heart it was entirely different. When a person's religion has no foundation, and when there is added mad ambition, of course he will use religion to do evil deeds, to become talons and claws for imperialism.

At Yenching University, Stuart's religious policy was one of laissez faire, glorified with the expression "religious freedom." At that time, the number of believers had increased, religious rituals were being observed, and he reported this to the American churches, calling upon American Christians to contribute gladly. I was teaching in the School of Religion and carried administrative responsibility, and I knew that he was using the name of the School of Religion to raise funds in the US. Contributors thought that they were giving to the School of Religion, but in fact the funds collected were used for all departments of the university, for he knew that theological education could not function broadly among the Chinese people. He knew that only university education could lead many persons to like and admire America, could create the thought that "America is first; China is useless," and could obtain real results in cultural aggression.

On several occasions I talked with him about plans for advancing theological education, and not once did I fail to feel that his face agreed but his spirit was absent, and that I was wasting my heart's blood. I also asked him several times how much capital the School of Religion had, how many professors' homes, and whether there were any dormitories for students. He would always mumble and say nothing, or turn right and left and speak of something else.

In 1947, I went to the US and personally examined the account books. Only then did I find out that the School of Religion had only three small funds, amounting in all to only 210,000 dollars. Because I scrutinized too strictly and pressed people too hard, he thought up a way to have me removed from the office of dean. I was preparing to go and work in another church institution, and plans for leaving Yenching had already been made when Leighton Stuart left Yenching and became US Ambassador to China. My associates urged me to stay, so I have remained at Yenching to this day.

As we see it from the religious viewpoint, Leighton Stuart has really never been warm-hearted for God and for Jesus Christ. He greatly dislikes the church, especially the Chinese Church. One year when the National Christian Council of China was meeting at Hangchow, Chekiang, he was invited to participate, and I also took part. He paid no attention to church affairs, he was bored by them. I personally saw and heard his disgust with

- 3 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

the church. Of course the church had faults, but he said the church was hopeless. But religion can be used; the church can be dominated. He had ways of doing that; no one perceived that he was using religion to cause us Chinese to receive the poison of US cultural aggression. Such aggression is mysterious; it is concealed; it creates in Chinese minds an obsession of "America First," and China second. It promotes a mental state of liking America, worshipping America, fearing America.

Stuart Furthered US Imperialism

Thirdly, I want to complain against Leighton Stuart for directly using political capital to further US imperialism's aggressive policies. He used religion, he used all sorts of seductive methods, to create in China a third force. He used that third force to correct Kuomintang corruption and at the same time to obstruct the revolution led by the Communists. This third force consists of liberals and individuals who like and worship America. These are the persons who are mentioned in the US White Paper. He thought that these persons were trusted by the Chinese people, that they could create public opinion; he never calculated that these persons, trained in America and Britain, with American and British education, had at least some scientific brains, had great hopes of their native land being united and advancing, and did not have a fixed prejudice against the Communist Party.

Leighton Stuart calls himself a "China expert," but he has not the faintest conception of the psychology of China's intellectuals. None of these persons, except a few who are American duped, is prepared to sell his soul. After World War I, Stuart's political interest became stronger; after 1929, he had fairly close relations with Chinese militarists and politicians, and had growing connections with the US State Department; so his political activities expanded greatly. In 1946, he became US Ambassador to China, and also Marshall's echoing worm. I cannot relate in detail his political activities; it will be sufficient if you read Professor Lei Chieh-ch'iung's "US Imperialism's Cultural Aggression as Seen in Leighton Stuart." Here I only quote briefly.

Professor Lei says: "In political matters, Stuart directed for Chiang Kai-shek the contemptible drama of calling a 'National Assembly' and promulgating a constitution. ... In economic matters, he negotiated the Treat of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation with the Chiang bandit government, as well as other public and secret treaties which in black and white provide that the US shall enjoy various rights legalizing China's colonial status." Not long after the treaty was concluded, Stuart came back to Yenching and I had dinner with him one evening. Just as the meal was finished he received Marshall's telegram of congratulation, and he was visibly very pleased. He said, "Such a treaty is surely to be considered right." His meaning was that when a weak nation makes a treaty with a strong one and suffers some disadvantage, what is wrong with that? Is not China getting real favors?

Thus Leighton Stuart began as a hypocritical crafty missionary, and ended as a henchman who tore apart the false mask of US imperialism.

I have made my complaint against Leighton Stuart; my words make clear what he does for US imperialism. There are many who accuse him; many who find fault with his writings.

Complaint Against World Council of Churches

But I have yet another complaint to make. Standing here, I want solemnly to lodge a serious protest against the World Council of Churches, to oppose its incomparably false resolution concerning the war in Korea. First, let me

- 4 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

explain my relationship with their organization. In the winter of 1939, the International Missionary Council called an ecumenical conference which met at Tambaram in Madras, India. This conference set up a Preparatory Committee for a World Council of Churches, of which I was a member; however, when I returned to China, since it was during China's war of resistance, I had no opportunity to share in this preparatory committee's work.

By 1947, its work was largely completed; and in August 1948, the World Council of Churches was organized in Amsterdam. The World of Council of Churches included 157 on 158 older and younger communions. I was invited to be one of the advisers. After organization, an honorary president and six presidents were elected, and I was one of the six. Five of the six represented the older or more advanced churches. I was the only person representing the younger churches. At that time I felt a glow of enthusiasm for I did not represent a mission; I represented churches which were independent, standing side by side with the missions. I did not merely represent China, but also the churches of the Philippines, Japan, India, Indonesia, Africa, and Latin America.

The World Council of Churches is a tremendous organization, and its funds come largely from American sources. But at that time I did not have clear vision; I could not see that Americans had traces of control in the council. On the other hand, I saw that many delegates of the younger churches and many youthful delegates of the European churches were all relatively progressive, and all approved of socialism. Dulles made a speech, and the Czech professor Hromadka also made a speech, and the two discussions were entirely different. The conference seemed to accept it all, to include everything, just as the church from the beginning has stood for ecumenical fellowship. The conference held sectional discussions, one of which discussed capitalism and also Communism, and when both sides had finished, it seemed like neither had touched the sore spot.

Following the conference I returned to China, and Peiping was soon liberated. According to the constitution, as one of the presidents, I should have attended an executive committee meeting each year, but I felt that my duty in my own country was heavier than my duty to the council. So since September 1948, I have not asked for an exit visa, and have not attended a single council meeting. In July 1950, the executive committee met in Canada and passed a false resolution concerning the war in Korea. I only saw this resolution at the end of last year, and I was exasperated: I felt that the Christian Church throughout the world needed an ecumenical fellowship, but that this fellowship, really dominated by US imperialism, had now done something which many members would certainly not approve.

My complaint here is not made in my capacity as a president of the World Council of Churches. A president speaks on behalf of the World Council of Churches, and according to its constitution, all six presidents must speak as one. I am a Chinese and a Christian, and know the organization of this council, and of course have the viewpoint of complaint, and the duty of protest. I have two points of protest.

First, with all the younger churches in the World Council and with all progressive Christians, I stand here to oppose US imperialism which uses its henchmen, such as Dulles, Van Dusen, and other reactionary warmongers, to control this world-wide organization which the churches need, to cleave asunder the world fellowship of Christian believers and to destroy the world church movement built by painfully over many years. What US imperialism's henchmen advocate is completely opposite to the Christian creed. Jesus Christ wanted believers united; the warmongers want to destroy their unity;

- 5 -

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIALCONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

Jesus Christ wanted the people to preserve world peace; they want to destroy world peace. The Nicean Creed of the Christian Church says: "I bequeath to the apostles one holy and universal church." Saint Augustine in his anti-Donatist writings explains this sentence as meaning that the church has four characteristics: (1) apostolic tradition, (2) unity, (3) holiness, and (4) universality. The Christian Church has been from the beginning until now a world-wide church movement.

Many US imperialists call themselves Christians, and they even dare take this world Saviour, this prince of peace, Jesus Christ, as an amulet of their aggression, making God an idol who will protect them in doing evil. The church has become their political tool; the church has changed its character; the gospel of the Christian Church in America has become the capital funds of Wall Street; the Christian cross in the US has been thrown down. In sympathy with the grieved heart of Jesus Christ, I cannot help but cry aloud, appealing to all younger churches that are members of the World Council to rise up together and oppose the control of US imperialism. Nor can I fail to cry aloud to all true believers in religion in the US. I must say to them: "Your Christian Church is being attacked and snuffed out by your imperialists. O Americans! If you love your country, you should at once arise and quench the wild fire which your imperialists have kindled. For this fire is an anti-Christian fire, and as it burns, it will consume the foundations of your nation. Your imperialists are even now destroying the World Council of Churches; before long they will destroy the foundations of the life of faith which your forefathers have handed down to you."

Second, I want to complain against the executive committee of the World Council of Churches. This complaint is almost against the World Council of Churches itself. This organization is a world-wide organization, not an organization of the churches of one nation, the US. But US imperialism by controlling and using the executive committee of the World Council of Churches, has insulted, corrupted, and destroyed the entire Council of Churches.

I complain against the executive committee because in July 1950 they passed a very false resolution in regard to the war in Korea. This resolution stated that the war in Korea was prepared by North Korea and that, therefore, North Korea is the aggressor. This affirmation was based on the report of the UN Committee on Korea. Even the stupidest person in the world would ask, who organized this committee on Korea? Is their report one-sided? Does it distort the facts? The resolution says: "We demand that the UN, which maintains world order, consider at once this aggressive action and authorize each member nation to support legal action about it."

The World Council of Churches ought to preserve world peace, but it is used by US imperialism as a tool for promoting world war. The resolution also said: "The Stockholm declaration only wants to make atomic weapons illegal, and it does not demand immediate effective continuous international supervision and control; this can only be looked on as propaganda tactics and cannot be viewed as a genuine proposal for peace." This sentence slanders the true burning desire of 500 million lovers of peace. The executive committee of the World Council of Churches, used by US imperialism, dares to distort the facts, to support the real aggressors, to insult the countless peace-loving people in the world. How fierce is the technique of US imperialism; how hateful are the crimes of US imperialism!

I have complained about Leighton Stuart and about the World Council, and now I must register a complaint against myself. I have received quite a measure of American and British education; I am very easily hoodwinked; I approach Britons and Americans very easily, but I am also very deeply tinged with China's ancient culture. In my life these two influences have acted as

- 6 -

CONFIDENTIAL**CONFIDENTIAL**

CONFIDENTIAL **CONFIDENTIAL**

50X1-HUM

foils to each other. Perhaps, if I had a bit of the spirit of China's nobility I might never have been a sycophant in any way before British and Americans. But I also have been deceived and used. Because I have taken part in world church conferences several times, Leighton Stuart could use my name to prove to American churches that their work in China was bringing good results, and thus increase his political capital of using religion.

I have not made the complaint in Leighton Stuart's presence, but am speaking behind his back; and doing so seems already too late. Fortunately I am speaking on behalf of my country and the people and am not taking advantage of a public matter for personal benefit. From now on I want to examine still more carefully, be still more cautious, and help others root out the poison of US imperialism's cultural aggression. As to my relation with the World Council of Churches, I still do not feel conscious of guilt. US imperialism has never yet been able to drag me under the water.

What I want to confess is my own dullness, my own lack of caution, and my inadequate striving. When I saw that very false resolution, I should have protested, should have made a complaint. Delaying until now to make solemn remonstrance is the result of a lackadaisical attitude created within me by US imperialist poison. I have today completely unburdened my heart to you, my comrades and associates. Your giving me this opportunity of complaint has given my soul a cleansing. From the bottom of my heart I thank you.

- E N D -

CONFIDENTIAL

- 7 -

CONFIDENTIAL